



STATE of CONNECTICUT
Office of Governmental Accountability
State Contracting Standards Board

Statutes, Regulations, Policies & Procedures (SRPP) Work Group

Tuesday, December 9, 2025 9:00 – 10:30 a.m.

Location: *Virtual Only*

In Attendance:

Thomas Ahneman, Chair of the SRPP Work Group
Rochelle Palache, Chair of the State Contracting Standards Board
Lauren Gauthier
Salvatore Luciano
James Marpe
Brenda Sisco

Gregory Daniels, Executive Director
Aaron Felman, Staff Attorney
Samson Anderson, Research Analyst
Aleshia Hall, Administrative Assistant

MINUTES

1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 9:08 a.m. by Chair Ahneman.

- A. **Roll Call** of Work Group Members was conducted as indicated above.

2. **Approval of Minutes**

- A. **April 22, 2025, meeting**

A motion to accept the minutes as written was made by Rochelle Palache.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Ahneman.

The motion passed unanimously with abstentions from Mr. Marpe and Ms. Gauthier.

- B. **August 20, 2025, meeting**

A motion to accept the minutes as written was made by James Marpe.

The motion was seconded by Brenda Sisco.

The motion passed unanimously with abstentions from Ms. Palache and Ms. Gauthier.

3. **Discussion of Rules of Practice, Part 2: Hearings**

Sec. 1-4e-7. Hearing Officers (a):

- Mr. Luciano sought clarification on the numbering in the Rules of Practice document as he finds it confusing to reference section 1-4e-7 as Hearing Officers that does not correlate to 4e-7 in the statute. Staff Attorney Felman provided context of standard enumeration and clarified that the Rules of Practice are a stand-alone document separate from the statute.

- Mr. Luciano expressed his concerns that the language in the opening sentence may be interpreted as limiting the power of the Chair. After a lengthy discussion for the purpose of clarification, Attorney Felman offered to include Ms. Gauthier's recommendation of rearranging the wording similar to the following: "*The board, by its chairperson or, at the direction of its chairperson, may designate a member of the board, the executive director, or any other person authorized by statute to be a hearing officer . . .*".
- In response to his request for clarification of the statute referenced in the first sentence, Attorney Felman explained that use of the word statute is intended as a "catch-all" reference that confirms the intent to comply with all other statutory authorities.

Sec. 1-4e-33. General Provisions (b):

- Ms. Gauthier sought clarification on the change made to replace *Board* with *Chairperson* and asked if that referenced only the Chair of the Board or the Chair of committees and work groups. Attorney Felman explained that the definition section of this document indicates that the use of *Chairperson* throughout the document refers to the *Chair of the Board*. Attorney Felman offered to make revisions throughout the document; however, Ms. Gauthier agreed that the current language is clear and no changes are necessary.

Sec. 1-4e-40. Final decision in a contested case:

- As a guardrail, Ms. Gauthier wants the language in this section to ensure that all final decisions require approval of the Board and cannot be finalized at the committee level.
- Mr. Luciano agreed that the entire Board should approve in most cases; however, the statute is written to give authority to the 4e-36 Contested Solicitations and Awards Subcommittee to make decisions without the Board, that are not appealable. Executive Director Daniels asked if Mr. Luciano wanted to pursue change in the statute to reflect that the need for Board approval applicable to the 4e-36 subcommittee. Mr. Luciano would prefer to focus on a legislative change on the issue of vendor name changes and stressed the importance of establishing a 4e-34 Work Group.
- Attorney Felman explained that he intentionally made much of this language broad to create a document that is flexible enough to apply to other areas of agency business such as bylaws and subcommittees as appropriate. Ms. Gauthier emphasized that is why she wants the language to be inclusive of the requirement for Board approval even on 4e-36 issues because of concerns taking place with other Boards in the State.
- Attorney Felman will review other statutes as appropriate to confirm that this document does not interfere with existing statutes. Mr. Luciano stated that the 4e-36 language applicable to 4e-36 should not be superseded by any other statutory language.
- Mr. Luciano referenced 4e-34 protocol authored by former Executive Director David Guay. Ms. Gauthier believes that it was adopted in June 2022 in reference to the "Respler case." Executive Director Daniels is familiar with the document and explained that it was a generic draft of an operational plan that does not reflect a 4e-34 process. Staff Attorney Felman confirmed that it is not a process, but rather, a general framework. Both

Executive Director Daniels and Attorney Felman are working to develop a process that will reflect the statute language.

- Having no further comments regarding the remainder of the document, it was agreed that all other changes were approved as written.

4. Old Business: None

5. New Business

A. Draft Language for Legislative Proposals

a. Proposal 1: C.G.S. § 4e-34

AN ACT STRENGTHENING THE ENFORCEMENT OF CONTRACTOR DISQUALIFICATION AND PREVENTING EVASION THROUGH NAME CHANGE OR REORGANIZATION

- Executive Director Daniels explained that this proposal addresses the concerns expressed earlier by Mr. Luciano regarding disqualification of vendors. The topic of an Excluded Parties List has been included in the agenda for the regular Board meeting on December 12, 2025.
- Executive Director Daniels explained that he did not include these Legislative Proposals on the agenda for the December 12, 2025, regular Board meeting because the agenda for that meeting had to be set prior to securing a quorum for this meeting. He wanted to share these Legislative Proposals with this Work Group before bringing them to the Board for discussion. Executive Director Daniels offered that, if this Work Group chooses to do so, they can vote to add it to the agenda. Ms. Sisco explained that the legislative session does not begin until February 2026, so she does not want to have a discussion in December that will require a repeat in January. She believes that we have time to bring our proposals to legislators.
- Ms. Gauthier said that they have been discussing this topic for three years and that the proposed language looks good. She asked that bankruptcy be included as a cause for disqualification. She referenced “the Respler case” in which a vendor had a history of convictions outside of Connecticut that were not detected because there was not an out-of-state background check made on the vendor. She believes it is important to close that loophole and allow for disqualifications due to out-of-state charges. Executive Director Daniels agreed to modify that language to include her recommendations prior to this dissemination to the Board members.
- Mr. Luciano agreed with the language of the proposal.
- In response to Chair Ahneman’s inquiry, Executive Director Daniels clarified that there is currently not an existing system for excluding bidders. There is no centralized database to track vendors who are disqualified from doing business with the State and this is a problem that is part of a much larger issue. He intends to bring his concerns to the full Board for discussion at the regular Board meeting on Friday. Ms. Gauthier referred to the benefits of a centralized purchasing system. Executive Director Daniels explained that maintaining a list is not enough, there needs to be a systematic electronic

system in place that would prevent payment being made to an excluded vendor.

- Mr. Luciano emphasized the importance of getting a 4e-34 Work Group established. He referenced that although Acronom cannot directly contract with the State, there is no way of preventing a vendor from subcontracting with them.
- Chair Ahneman, Mr. Luciano, and Ms. Gauthier all agreed that this process does not need to be controlled by the SCS Board and that it is outside the scope of our purview to do so. Executive Director Daniels confirmed that there is an internal DAS system that is on the front end, but the process would need to include the State Comptrollers and other agencies on the back end as well.
- All members of the Work Group agreed to elevate Legislative Proposal 1 to the Board for discussion and approval at the regular Board Meeting on December 12, 2025.

b. Proposal 2: C.G.S. § 4e-21 – Harmonization with DAS Statute

- Executive Director Daniels explained that the concerns in this proposal were brought to his attention by Gene Burk, Procurement Director at the Department of Administrative Services (DAS). Mr. Burk explained that the DAS statute has been changed to raise their threshold for purchases from \$10,000 to \$25,000 to match the federal acquisition standards. Universities and other agencies have worked together to synchronize their statutes to reflect this change as well. For the sake of harmonization and consistency, it is being recommended that we adjust these thresholds to align with other state agencies and federal standards. Executive Director Daniels explained that this is a technical change for discussion by this Work Group and the Board.
- Mr. Luciano agrees that this change is reasonable. He referenced comments made by Executive Financial Officer Kennison at the November regular board meeting that OPM is *partnering* with SCSB; he is concerned because we are an oversight agency.
- Ms. Sisco and Chair Palache both support this change and do not foresee any issues.
- All members of the Work Group agreed to elevate Legislative Proposal 2 to the Board for discussion and approval at the regular Board Meeting on December 12, 2025.

6. Action Items

A. Staff Action Items

- In advance of the Board meeting on December 12, 2025, **Executive Director Daniels** will update the Legislative Proposals 1 and 2 and disseminate them to the Board members.
- On December 29, 2025, **Attorney Felman** will distribute the revised Rules of Practice to the Work Group.
- **Executive Director Daniels and Staff Attorney Felman** will prepare 2026 Legislative Agenda for discussion at the next Work Group meeting with the intention of presenting it to the Board at the January 9, 2026, regular Board meeting.

B. Board Member Action Items

After receiving revised Rules of Practice from Staff Attorney Felman on December 29, 2025, the **Work Group Members** are to review for approval at the January 6, 2026, Work Group meeting with the intent of elevating the Rules of Practice and the Legislative Agenda to the Board at the regular meeting on January 9, 2026.

7. Adjournment

It was agreed that the next meeting of Work Group will be scheduled to take place virtually on Tuesday, January 6, 2026, from 9:00-10:30 a.m.

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:19 a.m. was made by Mr. Luciano
The motion was seconded by Rochelle Palache.
The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Aleshia M. Hall
Administrative Assistant